1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 8 9 JERRY HUDSON, No. C05-01735RSL 10 Plaintiff, 11 ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE v. TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY 12 MICHAEL CHERTOFF, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion for Leave to File Supplemental 16 Authority" (Dkt. #29). Though the motion is noted for August 10, 2007, the Court has already 17 entered an order granting defendants' motion to dismiss and for summary judgment. See Dkt. 18 #31. Plaintiff's motion is therefore DENIED as moot.<sup>1</sup> 19 DATED this 9<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2007. 20 MMS Casnik 21 Robert S. Lasnik 22 United States District Judge 23 24 25 26

27

28

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Even if plaintiff's motion was not moot, the Court notes that it was filed nearly three months after the filing of plaintiff's original response and plaintiff does not argue that this new material was unavailable to him prior to filing his original response. It is therefore unlikely that the Court would have granted such a motion even if it was noted prior to the Court issuing its opinion. Nor does the Court believe the supplemental material would have had any material bearing on the outcome of the case.